

5 December 2012

Dear Mr. and Mrs. EIS Co-Lead Agencies:

I have been a resident of the San Juan Islands for the last six years, which is a community that stands to be affected by the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal. I am writing to request that the EIS Environmental Impact Statement includes the farms, towns, fields, and seas along the entire National and international transportation corridor. Some questions and concerns I hope you address in a thorough, fair, and extensive manner include...

- what ~~are~~ potential impacts that open coal transport cars could have on public health in the communities they cross?
- what are potential impacts that a damaged or sunken coal ship could have on the aquatic ecosystems, both domestic and international?
- what are the effects that a normally-

functioning coal ship could have in terms of marine noise pollution, both domestically and internationally?

- what are potentially unforseen and difficult-to-measure costs to the scenic beauty of our Salish Sea?
- How would tourism and commercial boating be affected by the addition of nearly a thousand immense coal ships?

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, my concerns of course include this specific bioregion. However, a valid and objective EIS will observe the far-reaching and broad affects in Asia as well. What would the local public health impacts be of coal combustion in the proposed new markets abroad? How does toxic air pollution cross the Pacific Ocean back to the United States from Asia? My point is that we need to expand the impacts of this proposed coal transport to

also include the direct effects of coal
burning as well.

It is my belief that considering even this
short list of concerns in an objective manner
will lead you, Mr. and Mrs. Els co-Lead
Agencies, to realize that mitigation is
not an adequate course of action. Non-action
is the best course of action.

Thank you for your time and consideration—

Justine Pope
Eastsound, Washington
5 December 2012

